

Minutes of a Public Hearing in regards to By-law No 950/11, held in the Clearwater County Council Chambers on February 14, 2012.

The Public Hearing was called to order at 1:16 P.M. with the following being Present:

Reeve:	Pat Alexander
Councillors:	Earl Graham
	Bob Bryant
	Case Korver
	Dick Wymenga
	Jim Duncan
	John Vandermeer
Municipal Manager:	Ron Leaf
Recording Secretary:	Christine Heggart
Development Officer:	Keith McCrae
Development Officer:	Marilyn Sanders
Mountaineer:	Stu Salkeld
B94:	Diane Fingler
	Marshall Morton
Matt Martinson	
	Brian Lopeter
Mike Haugen	
	Patsy Haupt
Rick Emmons	
	Ron Scott
Frank McBride	
	Kathy Dewling
Erik Hansen	
	Ken Qually
Kimberley Jakowski	
	Pete Prystay
Darrell Philip	
	Frank Sheasby
Marianne Cole	
	Tom Tisdale
Debora Martens	
	Brooklyn Laut
Eddy Sehn	
	Kevin Flikinger
Sandra Sehn	
	Ryan Shaw
Tony Hammonds	
	Scott Morrison
Leanne Winchester	
	Doug Dahl
Donna Watson	
	Michelle Swanson
Larry Cameron	
	Linda Hemphill
Garnet Bailey	
	Gordon Watson
Sharon Rubeling	
	Brian Donnelly
Vic Maxwell	
	Gary West
Darren Bauer	
	Paul Stone
Keith Gale	
	Troy Speight
Ron A. Miller	
	Paul Cowley
Launa Gordon	
	Rick Anderson

Dori Weston	Marion Schafer
Mary Moffard	Merle Pederson
Michael Moffard	Glen McCrae
Clifford Sever	Reg Kyncl
Rob Dewling	Brian Burrington
Barb Donnelly	Chad Gardeski
Heather Morgan	Danielle DuPaul
Lorena Tisdale	Eldon Grant
Shelby Tisdale	Terri Fraser
Janice McDonell	Diane Spoor
H. Wylhuizer	Jane Henderson
Dennis Ross	Grace Qually
David Glover	Luke Kurata
Alanna Arns	Alexa Birchall
Patricia M. Grant	Herb Wylhuizen
Monica Schmutz	Bill Minnes
Deb Pederson	Roy Henrie
Josh Meyer	Anita Bauer
Beryl Wickins	John Allan
Wayne K. Dahl	Russ Croft
Travis McIntyre	Marilyn Christiansen
Mike Head	Bill Arns
Gale Gale	Italo Pedrazzini
Van Rideout	Jochen Rubeling
Walter Atchison	Hamish Grant
M. Bloxham	Mary Small
Bobbi-Jo Sever	Lorna Moore
Kristen Tetley	Ken Scott
Randall Trites	Dwight Oliver
B.J. Donnelly	May Dahl
D.R. Watson	Heather Thompson
Kim Peats	

Reeve Alexander outlined the hearing agenda and process to be used for the Public Hearing.

Mr. McCrae provided an overview of the application for the purpose of creating a residential estate subdivision comprised of approximately 54 fully serviced parcels ranging from 1.2 to 1.7 acres in size. The subject quarter section is located approximately 2.5 miles south of the Town of Rocky Mountain House. Three numbered companies, 490363 Alberta Ltd. represented by Darren Bauer, 496000 Alberta Ltd. and 1307594 Alberta Ltd. presently hold joint title to the balance of the NE 33-38-07-W5 containing ±152.42 acres. The subject quarter section is bound on the east and partially on the north by the Everdell Road. The subject property is located ½ mile south of the intersection of SH 752 and the Everdell Road.

Mr. McCrae summarized the process for the development application, the background of the application and noted that Bill Minnes of Bradwill Consultants prepared an "Outline Plan" for the subject property according to a "Terms of Reference" approved by Council as part of a previous application.

Mr. McCrae reviewed sections of the MDP applicable to the proposed development.

The Chair invited questions from Council.

There were no questions from Council.

The Chair invited the applicant to speak.

Darren Bauer addressed concerns recently raised in the Mountaineer and at previous hearings, including the operations of the communal water and wastewater systems. Mr. Bauer noted that water would be metered and infrastructure would be self-supporting by resident users and would not require the investment of municipal taxes. Mr. Bauer added that consultants would speak to the water system and septage treatment facilities design and pump tests already completed, which were 100% successful.

Bill Minnes reviewed the process undertaken to develop the outline plan and stated that the plan meets the regulations within the Municipal Development Plan (MDP). Mr. Minnes provided a background on his experience and referenced sections of the MDP emphasizing that: environmentally significant areas will be protected and enhanced; most of the existing agricultural lands on the parcel will be conserved; the plan supports the compatibility of the proposed development with neighbouring land use in the area; infrastructure expansion will match the area; and the plan will provide for a range of rural residential – a first with communal water and wastewater in the County.

Mr. Minnes noted the public input regarding the use of agricultural land and water as being important and assured that the project will include natural capital protection. Mr. Minnes stated that the outline plan fully meets the principles and provisions of the MDP and noted the nature and extent of farming in local area and location and number of non-farm residences in immediate area.

Mr. Minnes noted rural residential development demands are expected to remain strong and the County's MDP promotes rural

residential growth while minimizing the impacts on agricultural lands.

Mr. Minnes referenced the Outline plan and stated that nearly half of the area will be residential with the remaining lands being agricultural or public lands.

Mr. Minnes noted the Meadow Ponds Outline Plan incorporates County standards and anticipated Provincial standards as well. He reiterated the outline plan meets the MDP requirements in terms of: farmland assessment rating usage; lots sizes serviced by communal water/sewer; a 50 foot buffer; and the safe location of accesses; Mr. Minnes also noted that a transportation impact assessment had been completed in terms of the impact on the Everdell Road and that the subdivision includes FireSmart provisions.

Councillor Duncan asked if the title for the primary and secondary conservation lands would lie with the County. Mr. Minnes confirmed those lands would be turned over to County.

Councillor Wymnaga questioned the wastewater treatment system and Mr. Minnes noted the consultant will address the system later in the presentation.

Councillor Alexander questioned the access points, asking which one is temporary and which one is future usage. Mr. Minnes discussed access roads and sightlines.

Councillor Korver noted the emergency access would need to be restricted.

Glen McCrae from Allworth Consultants provided a background on ethics and professionalism of the various consultants involved in the development of this outline plan. He noted that all proposed systems adhere to guidelines of the County and the Province and are well known and effective systems.

Glen McCrae noted the water system would be supplied by well water through a potable water distribution system. He noted the sanitary system is a communal system and includes a collection and treatment system.

Josh Meyer provided an overview of the communal wastewater system and the differences of the proposed system in relation to conventional septic system.

Councillor Wymnaga asked question regarding ability to drive on lands over the wastewater treatment field. Glen McCrae responded that vehicles and equipment would be able to drive over the area.

Garnet Bailey provided a background on the proposed water systems, including features such as computerized monitoring, alarms and the types of data collected.

Van Rideout spoke to the methodology used in assessing groundwater and the nature of the preliminary field survey.

Mr. Rideout referenced visuals of groundwater and confined and unconfined aquifers and provided information, scenarios and effects noting the field verified survey details measurement of water tables and benchmarking and the process to test the well in the area and details on the analysis. Mr. Rideout provided an overview of wells tested in the areas versus the production well.

Mr. Rideout provided a historical groundwater supply evaluation and a draw down table and noted that he is confident there is

enough water to supply the proposed subdivision and local residents.

The Chair invited anyone in favour of the application to speak.

John Allen, who lives adjacent to the development, noted he would like to build a house there; that the water is clean and across the road cows in creek all year round; that revenue from farmland is minimal; that the County should straighten out the S-bends on the roads. He concluded stating not everyone wants to live in town and this subdivision will be of benefit to the community.

The Chair invited anyone in opposition of the application to speak.

Grace Qually read Morley Barrett's letter which stated this application is a true test of Council and referenced the guiding principles of the MDP and questioned the essence of a new hamlet being proposed, versus the hamlet growth commitment reflected in the MDP.

Ms. Qually noted Council shouldn't view residents as the enemy and stated a rural lifestyle is available and that there are a number of existing subdivisions with lots available. Ms. Qually questioned whether the subdivision would be fair to the Town of Rocky Mountain House or the existing hamlets or the other six subdivisions. Ms. Qually noted that overpopulating an area takes away from rural lifestyle.

Shelby Tisdale read a letter from Pete McLellan who expressed concerns with the impact on fish bearing streams, loss of agricultural land, and traffic. Shelby Tisdale read another letter from Lorena Tisdale who is concerned with opening the door into all agricultural land development, wildlife stress, water consumed, the decrease of agricultural land and conflicts in the rural living.

Ms. Tisdale noted her own concern with the waiving of the six month mandatory waiting period and considered the actions bullying by Council.

Rob Dewling noted concern with tax burden and the maintenance of the "gifted" public lands, the need for monies in trust, and noted the MDP it is a living breathing document.

Sandra Sehn noted Council overlooked the fact they live on the most dangerous road in the County and the need for road correction both of the S bends and the need for upgrade of the "Devils Elbow" intersection.

Tom Tisdale noted concern with development taking away farmland.

Deborah Marten provided a background of previous application dates concerning this proposal and noted concern with the decline of farms in Alberta.

Wayne Dahl noted there are too many developments in the area and is concerned with water usage, sewage problem, dogs chasing cows and that losing land from acreages for first parcel out and with the multi-lot subdivision.

Gayle Gale noted concern with stability of water table and would like independent water testing.

Kristen Tetley noted the development requirements in their own property development and noted that everyone should be able to do what they wish with their property within guidelines. Ms. Tetley noted the subdivision must meet all requirements. She also stated a concern with the calculation of the farmland assessment rating and provided an alternate calculation for Council's consideration. Ms. Tetley reiterated the need for rules, regulations and fairness.

Bobbi-Jo Sever noted farms are better than acreages and the concern with water, recreational space, road use, competing subdivisions and noise and reiterated the need for farmers and farmland.

David Watson read a letter from Wayne and Lorraine Shirley stating that the parcel should remain agricultural land and their concerns with water and sewer contamination, sewer system failure, fire and road maintenance issues.

Kathy Dewling noted concern with the impact on the sport fishery in Prairie Creek, river otter population increase, and potential for sewage release and dead fish.

Brian Burrington noted concern with the attitude of Council in allowing this proposal to come back. He also stated that the subdivision will provide no extra tax dollars, will contribute to degradation of the seasonal water course and expressed concern with the water and sewer systems. He also expressed concern with maintenance costs, increased demands for fire and policing, weed spraying, grass mowing, litter control, dog control, and the loss of farmland. Mr. Burrington stated the County doesn't need more country residential at the moment and is concerned with impact on fish and wildlife populations.

Italo Pedrazzini agreed with Brian Burrington's comments and asked to clarify what Country residential means; his interpretation is that Country residential is one acreage off a quarter section. Mr. Pedrazzini noted his concern with recreational usage of quads and dirt bikes.

Doug Dahl expressed concern with the loss of farmland and the need for agriculture for the food supply. He stated this decision is precedent setting and future farmland will be lost. Mr. Dahl noted the test well went dry in 2006. Mr. Dahl referenced a Red Deer County report stating that residential properties are not self-supporting. He noted concern with policing costs.

EARL GRAHAM: That Council extends the meeting beyond 4:30pm.

CARRIED 7/0

Ross Croft provided background on his off-grid solar home and country retirement residence and his concern with traffic; and that more people come in and destroy the atmosphere that he enjoys.

Dennis Ross noted concern with last public meeting and the number of those opposed outnumbered those in favour and stated the developer is dictating Council's decisions. Mr. Ross noted the other multi-lot subdivisions in the County and their suitability for acreages and not to remove prime farmland. He further noted his concern with water usage and storm runoff.

Mike Head expressed concern that his letter was not read at previous meeting and that the plan does not comply with MDP. He noted concern with farming, environmental impact and too many developments already exist in continuous conflict.

Marianne Cole noted she supports preserving agricultural land and protecting environmentally sensitive land. She noted concern with natural capital protection, farmland assessment rating, County ownership of reserve lands and taxpayer burden associated with this development, dust, safety, conflicting uses, good land taken out of production and the irreversible environmental footprint. Ms. Cole noted the utter disregard for public input and the need for agricultural land for food production and that luxury living should be secondary. Ms. Cole noted her support of development in Ferrier area or first parcels out and stated her concern with conflicting lifestyles, other real estate options available and defiance of the principles of the MDP.

Barb Donnelly noted concerned with water and that alarms are run by computers, concerned about sewage, agricultural land, traffic, driveway access, traffic flow, identified that in another subdivision no residences have been built just RVs being stored. Mrs. Donnelly questioned why this application was revisited and there is a need in the bylaw to limit the number of applications that can be made on a property.

Marilyn Christiansen noted concern with democracy, effect on lives of all residents of the County, that all voices in the County need to be heard and expressed concern around the direct and indirect harm associated with this application.

Beryl Wickins noted he is a senior and pays school taxes and questioned who is going to pay for extra two buses. He noted concern with water wells.

Pete Prystay noted concern with traffic, s-corners, view, water, sewage, wetlands, red larch, protection of agricultural lands, wetlands, wild lands, drainage issue, sewage and having four subdivisions within walking distance of his home.

Vic Maxwell referenced a soil map and distributed same to Council. He noted that the subject property contains Caroline Loam and referenced the Canada Dominion Land Survey and is the only outlet for 800 acres of land. Mr. Maxwell noted concern with breakdown with County and planners and is not in favour of this multi-lot subdivision and that development should be scattered in remote corners. He further noted concern with excess of lots on the market which are not selling, culverts, beaver dams, high water flows through the property in recent years, and the preservation of agricultural land.

Donna Watson noted her agreement with previous presentations and noted her concern with loss of agricultural land, food supply and water.

Brian Donnelly read a letter from Chuck Bolton, a resident of the Town of Rocky House, stating that the subdivision would be another loss for Town and that the 54 lots should be developed in the Town and concern with County taking revenue for Town.

Luke Kurata, lawyer for the Everdell Quality of Life Land Owners (EQOL) Group, submitted a brief with historical analysis as well as a previous MGB decision involving the County. Mr. Kurata noted the regulation stipulating that the planning officer may refuse to accept an application until a period of six months unless the circumstances have changed significantly. Mr. Kurata noted the possibility of injunctive relief if application was

approved and that the problem is greater than hearing the application within the prescribed waiting period. He noted substantive issues in relation to the FAR assessment and expressed concern that the application was circumventing the planning process.

Mr. Kurata noted the issue with country residential versus residential estate and that the lot size matters little as the concept has evolved to shrunken acreage, to make them more saleable. Mr. Kurata referenced land use legislation in Ontario and the problem associated with "checker boarding", instead of separating from an adjacent property.

Mr. Kurata noted concern with the illusion of 15% land gifting is a device contrivance to make the subdivision work and has not stood up in a court of law historically as "you cannot do indirectly what you are prohibited from doing directly".

Mr. Kurata noted the County needs to be careful to be adopting a liability and the potential for adopting orphaned parcels of land.

Mr. Kurata cautioned against the acquisition due to occupier's liability and noted the need for due diligence as the standard of care is higher for municipalities.

Mr. Kurata also noted that the adoption of orphaned parcels may be seen as a partnership in the co-development in the parcel of land and also attracts liabilities.

Mr. Kurata responded to questions of the definition of an orphaned parcel and referenced the farmland/field rating map.

The Chair asked for written comments from the public.

Copies of the written submissions were distributed to Council. 10 letters were received.

Ms. Sanders noted that letters received from Barb Donnelly, Brian Donnelly, Mike and Joanna Head, Barbara PriceDay, Peter PriceDay, Dennis Ross, Donna and David Watson had already been read during the verbal opposition portion of the hearing..

Ms. Sanders read a letter from Joseph Larose who expressed concern with main roads already experiencing heavy traffic, loss of good agricultural land and suggested that if approved the developer should be required to pay for a pedestrian/bicycle path.

Ms. Sanders read a letter from Merl and Deborah Patterson regarding their concerns with development, impacts on the watershed, sport fishing, water supply, obscure vision corner, traffic, and cost.

Ms. Sanders read a letter from E. Zaborski concerned with good farm land being lost and shortage of food.

The Chair asked for comments received from referral agencies.

Energy Resources Conservation Board

The ERCB has reviewed and completed a search of ERCB regulated wells and pipelines in the vicinity and their records indicate the following:

- Other wells may exist within the area of this application. However, ERCB has determined that these wells are either licensed as sweet wells or have an ERCB Level 1 sour designation and meet the recommended setback distance requirement of 100m.
- Other pipelines may exist within the area of the referred application. However, the ERCB has determined that these pipelines licensed as sweet or have an ERCB Level 1 sour designation. For these types of pipelines, there is no regulated setback distance however, the right-of-way must be observed.

Mr. McCrae noted the above mentioned setbacks do not affect the proposed development.

Imperial Oil Resources

Alexa Birchall submitted concerns regarding the Meadow Pond Estates Outline Plan as revised July 2011.

Imperial Oil has a water injection well at 10-33-38-7W5 and associated road and pipeline. Imperial does not object to the development, per se, but needs to have the following concerns addressed in order to protect our interests.

Road/Access

- The section of road that falls within the development will need to be designated as an "improvement left in place" and an agreement signed to that effect. The responsibility for the road would transfer to the landowner and Imperial would be absolved of any liability for reclamation.
- Imperial would need to be provided alternate access to the wellsite either by one of the proposed roads or alternate access not currently shown. We would require an approach off any developed roads.
- The change to the access would require an amendment to the surface lease for the access and acreage. A revised survey would need to be provided to Imperial to use in the lease amendment.
- A crossing agreement will be required for any roads crossing our high pressure line. This would provide engineering controls to protect the line and access in the future if required.

Waste Disposal Field

- It appears part of the waste disposal field is partially within our lease. This area will need to be revised and a generous setback provided from the lease. This is due to the issues this would cause for our reclamation work. Imperial does not allow 3rd party improvements within our lease boundaries. Additional assurances will need to be provided that materials from the waste disposal field would not migrate onto our lease.

FortisAlberta Inc.

No objection.

Rocky Gas Co-op – Craig Cannaday, Manager

The Co-op does have an existing gas line running east & west on the southern boundary of this property which must be located prior to any development taking place if this proposal is successful. If at any time there is a request to have this line lowered or moved it will be at the owner's expense. Also, the developer's must be aware that the cost of installing the main natural gas line to this proposed development and within the

development is at their expense, this means all the main lines required to serve each lot.

Alberta Transportation – Gail Long

The Department has no objections to the proposed outline plan and redesignation of the subject property for the purpose of creating a multi-lot country residential subdivision. They advise that the Department is currently working on a redesign of the Highway 752 intersection at this location. The developer should be made aware that changes may be made to the existing Highway 752 access in the future.

Alberta Sustainable Resource Development, - Don Baker

The interest from Sustainable Resource Development would be in the protection of the bed and shore and riparian area associated with the drainage that runs through the property. The concept plan indicates an ER along the drainage. Additional protection is proposed in the form of Primary Conservation Area, Secondary Conservation Areas and Municipal Reserve Land. Some of the lots are shown as bordering the ER. To further protect the drainage these lots could be setback from the ER. The road drainage system must be designed to minimize erosion into the drainage system.

Agricultural Services – Matt Martinson, Manager

The Agricultural Services Department appreciates being involved with the draft outline plan for Meadow Ponds Estates, specifically related to the conservation and appropriate use of agricultural lands within the plan area. The options we felt suitable for the use of the agricultural open space areas could potentially significantly benefit the property owners as well as the agricultural community.

For example, the open space agricultural areas could be used for grazing, and or forage harvesting (to be utilized by domestic livestock) or for the domestic production of fruits and vegetables (community gardens). The Agricultural Services Department also sees considerable potential value in applied research/demonstration projects relating to riparian area protection, grazing/livestock management, invasive plant management, annual crop production, to mention a few. Although at this time not specifically discussed with Council or the Agricultural Services Board, and recognizing additional details needing to be worked out, I see a tremendous value in collaborating with the estates residents on agricultural topics relevant to the agricultural open space areas for the benefit of the residents and the greater agricultural community.

Clearwater County Public Works

Clearwater County has reviewed the proposed Outline Plan as well as the Traffic Impact Assessment submitted by the developer's engineers. Clearwater County agrees the described east access point should be designated as the main access to the development and that the north access be designated for emergency access only.

Clearwater County also agrees that a Type IIa intersectional treatment is required for the proposed east access. The County also requires that all Type IIa intersectional treatments be constructed to include acceleration and deceleration tapers as well as the bypass portion.

The described north access, designated for emergency use only, requires a Type Ia intersection as well as a knock down gate.

All internal roads shall be, but are not limited to, be constructed as per the Clearwater County Residential Subdivisions Standards Policy, Road Standards Policy, and Approach Construction Guidelines policy.

A meeting with the public works department is recommended to discuss specific design criteria for the proposed development.

Municipal Planning Commission

The Municipal Planning Commission is of the opinion that the proposed development and draft outline plan are in compliance with the County's Municipal Development Plan and Land Use By-law, therefore, it is their recommendation that Council favorably consider granting second and third readings to the subject Land Use Bylaw Amendment and that Council adopt the "Meadow Ponds Estates Outline Plan".

Reeve Alexander stated that the Public Comment, both in favour and opposed, and Referral Agency Comment portions of the hearing were now concluded. Reeve Alexander stated that Council would reconvene the meeting as soon as possible and that the meeting date would be advertised.

Reeve Alexander recessed the meeting at 6:40 p.m.

Reeve Alexander reconvened the meeting at 9:01 A.M. on February 29, 2012 with the following in attendance:

Pat Alexander	Tony Hammonds
Earl Graham	Barb Donnelly
Dick Wymenga	Pauline Calvert
Case Korver	Peter Prystay
Bob Bryant	Norman Weilder
Jim Duncan	Bob Nicolay
John Vandermeer	Gale Gale
Ron Leaf	Fred E. Small
Christine Heggart	David Watson
Keith McCrae	Reg Kyncl
Marilyn Sanders	Dennis Ross
Mike Haugen	Laura Bertaniolle
Marianne Cole	John Allan
M. Bloxham	Mary Mofford
Frank McBride	Lorena Tisdale
Donna Watson	Michael Moffard
Marilyn Christiansen	Troy Speight
Mike Head	Vic Maxwell
John Morgan	Doug Dahl
Hamish Grant	Stu Stakeld
Pat Grant	Luke Kurata
May Dahl	Darren Bauer
Shelby Tisdale	Marion Schafer
Brooklyn Laut	Glen McCrae
Kristen Tetley	Ken Scott
Barb Chahley	Grace Qually
Bryan Georget	Ken Qually
Keith Gale	Larry Cameron
Wayne Dahl	Debroa Martens
Michelle Swanson	Merle Pederson
Janice McDonell	Dale Clearwater
Bill Minnes	Van Rideout
Rob Dewling	Anita Bauer

The Chair read a letter from Marianne Cole, on behalf of EQOL, requesting that EQOL be allowed to summarize their concerns. Should EQOL not be allowed to summarize she asked that the Chair summarize the verbal and written concerns expressed at the February 14 meeting.

Mr. Alexander noted that Council had received a legal opinion indicating that if one party was to speak all would need to be afforded the opportunity to speak, which would result in a duplication of the February 14 Public Hearing as well as raise the potential for legal challenge.

With respect to the request that the Chair summarize the various presentations and letters, Mr. Alexander stated that Council had opportunity to review the material presented and was confident in their understanding of the concerns expressed by the public. Mr. Alexander concluded by stating that Council had stated prior to the recess of the February 14 meeting that the public input and referral agency comment portions of the hearing were concluded and that Council would be following the Public Hearing agenda format set out on February 14.

The Chair invited the Applicant to respond to concerns.

Bill Minnes provided information for clarification and distributed a response to Council summarizing the concerns raised which were principally concerns with: loss of farmland, water, storm water runoff, traffic volumes and road safety, impact of the development on farms in area, the formula used to calculate acreages, individual visions for the County, the quality of life for existing residential and the creation of too many residential lots in the local real estate market.

Mr. Minnes noted he feels majority of the concerns are addressed in the Outline Plan and the incorporated standards which are sourced from the MDP.

Mr. Minnes noted the developer must still make application for water and waste water licensing through AB Environment and that many of the detailed concerns must be dealt with through the subdivision application process. If changes are required in relation to specific issues, the Applicant is prepared to make adjustments to lot sizes or other specific issues, if required to do so during the subdivision application stage, which they intend to complete in two parts.

Darren Bauer provided information on the marketing concept of the outline plan and again spoke to the concern regarding too many lots for sale in the area. He stated that the location and proximity to Town make this subdivision attractive to many individuals.

Glen McCrae provided additional detail regarding the pressure distribution system over the entire treatment field and stated that weight restrictions would not pose an issue with regard to the use of the lands or the operations of the sewage treatment system.

Councillor Wymenga referenced the Alberta Environment regulations not to graze animals or food products over a septic field. Glen McCrae noted the difference between a high quality effluent field and a septic field.

Councillor Duncan asked whether the treatment facility could potentially create a soft spot in the field and Mr. McCrae noted the system is sized to soil analysis and will be buried based on either a trench system to buried system dependent on size.

Mr. Minnes addressed concerns raised with assessment of fisheries and stated the report covers on unnamed tributary to Prairie Creek and the habitat in the unnamed tributary does not contain sport fish.

Mr. Minnes responded to concerns raised about traffic, access to northern acreages, safety of traffic and stated the decision to realign the Provincial Highway (Devil's Elbow) is up to Alberta Transportation and they have been notified of the redesignation application to take into consideration. Mr. Minnes also noted site lines along Everdell Road are in excess of 400m to south and 600m to north, which exceeds Alberta Transportation's required distances of 200m.

Van Rideout responded to concerns regarding the water well and availability of quality of groundwater in the Province. Mr. Rideout described the quantity of water available for use and referenced the number of Albertans using ground water and surface water, as well as averages of groundwater used by Alberta homes under the Water Act.

Mr. Rideout noted the subdivision will impose water conservation best practices noting statistics regarding the average water usage for rural Albertans, the estimated total quantity of water use for the proposed subdivision and the required flow rate – 4.7 gallons per minute – to supply the needs of the subdivision. Mr. Rideout noted the existing flow rate indicated 21.69 gallons per minute.

Mr. Rideout clarified the need for a second well was for observation from the same aquifer as the target supply well and the associated benefits of more accurate review of the hydraulic parameters of the formation.

Mr. Rideout responded to Gayle Gale's concern of not testing all neighbouring wells and noted that at the licensing stage, which is required for the condition of subdivision, not redesignation, would provide the opportunity to notify and well test the recommended minimum area.

Councillor Wymenga questioned how long was the well tests were run and Mr. Rideout noted it was under 48 hours and that the well pumped 32 to 35 imperial gallons per minute for 36 hours and that a detailed assessment would be required by AB Environment during the licensing of the well at the subdivision stage.

Mr. Alexander addressed the comment from Imperial Oil regarding their lease and Mr. Minnes noted any concerns of this nature would be addressed at the subdivision stage.

Mr. Minnes summarized saying there has been a significant amount of information of a technical nature discussed and that traditionally the technical information would be presented at the Municipal Planning Commission (MPC) level, as opposed to during the redistricting application. However, the applicant felt that it was extremely important to provide the level of information at this policy stage to assure Council that this is a valid proposal.

Mr. Bauer concluded stating that there are more stages to this process and more detailed work to be completed during which he believes the various concerns can be addressed.

Adjournment at 9:55 A.M.

MUNICIPAL MANAGER

REEVE